

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 200

May 24, 1995, 6:15 p.m.
Page S-7360 Temp. Record

BUDGET RESOLUTION/Research, Technology, & Trade

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1996-2002 . . . S. Con. Res. 13. Domenici motion to table the Exon (for Bingaman) amendment No. 1162.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 53-47

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. Con. Res. 13, the fiscal year 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution, will reduce projected spending over 7 years to balance the budget by fiscal year (FY) 2002 without increasing taxes. Savings that will accrue from lower debt service payments (an estimated \$170 billion) will be dedicated to a reserve fund, which may be used for tax reductions after enactment of laws to ensure a balanced budget. Highlights include the following: the rate of growth in Medicare will be slowed to 7.1 percent; Medicaid's rate of growth will be slowed to 5 percent and it will be transformed into a block grant program; the Commerce Department and more than 100 other Federal programs, agencies, and commissions will be eliminated; welfare and housing programs will be reformed; agriculture, energy, and transportation subsidies will be cut; foreign aid will be cut; defense spending will be cut and then allowed to increase back to its 1995 level; and Social Security will not be altered.

The Exon (for Bingaman) amendment would express the sense of the Senate that the numbers in this resolution reflect the assumption that the Appropriations Committee will make it a high priority for the next 7 years to maintain the FY 1995 spending levels (without adjustment for inflation) for research, technology and trade promotion, and for trade law enforcement, and that Senate conferees on the budget resolution will not agree to any revenue reductions below current law unless the resolution sets limits that will permit spending on these purposes at FY 1995 levels.

The amendment was offered after all debate time had expired. However, some statements on amendments were added to the record or were made before the amendments were offered and before debate time had expired. Also, by unanimous consent, 1 minute of time was allowed on each amendment for explanatory statements before each vote. Senator Domenici moved to table the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

(See other side)

YEAS (53)			NAYS (47)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (53 or 98%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)		Republicans (1 or 2%)	Democrats (46 or 100%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Helms		Jeffords	Akaka	Inouye		
Ashcroft	Hutchison			Baucus	Johnston		
Bennett	Inhofe			Biden	Kennedy		
Bond	Kassebaum			Bingaman	Kerrey		
Brown	Kempthorne			Boxer	Kerry		
Burns	Kyl			Bradley	Kohl		
Campbell	Lott			Breaux	Lautenberg		
Chafee	Lugar			Bryan	Leahy		
Coats	Mack			Bumpers	Levin		
Cochran	McCain			Byrd	Lieberman		
Cohen	McConnell			Conrad	Mikulski		
Coverdell	Murkowski			Daschle	Moseley-Braun		
Craig	Nickles			Dodd	Moynihan		
D'Amato	Packwood			Dorgan	Murray		
DeWine	Pressler			Exon	Nunn		
Dole	Roth			Feingold	Pell		
Domenici	Santorum			Feinstein	Pryor		
Faircloth	Shelby			Ford	Reid		
Frist	Simpson			Glenn	Robb		
Gorton	Smith			Graham	Rockefeller		
Gramm	Snowe			Harkin	Sarbanes		
Grams	Specter			Heflin	Simon		
Grassley	Stevens			Hollings	Wellstone		
Gregg	Thomas						
Hatch	Thompson						
Hatfield	Thurmond						
	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

This amendment would direct conferees to keep spending limits at a level high enough to reach certain goals which it specifies. Unfortunately, those goals are not very specifically defined. Giving vague instructions to conferees would not in any way improve the operations of the conference. Reluctantly, therefore, we are forced to vote to table this amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The Republican budget before us will cut Federal investment in technology research programs and in trade programs. We oppose both cuts. Under this resolution, technology investment will decline from the current .48 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to .26 percent by 2002. The Bingaman amendment, instead, would express support for cutting just a little less, to .31 percent of GDP. We do not favor any cuts at all, but, as a matter of political reality, we are hopeful that our colleagues will be supportive of this modest amendment. Government investment in basic research and technology fueled economic growth in America for much of this century. Unfortunately, many Republicans are now of the opinion that such investment is not a proper role for the Government. The United States' main economic competitors, Japan and Germany, do not share this opinion: they are each investing approximately .6 percent of their GDP on research and development efforts. If our Republican colleagues continue to refuse to push for American technological advances, our children and grandchildren may be condemned to a less prosperous, less healthy, and less secure future.

The Bingaman amendment would also increase spending on trade programs. Our fear is that our Republican friends' laissez faire attitude toward trade may have disastrous consequences. Past efforts to promote exports have yielded tremendous returns in increased exports, which have created jobs and raised the standard of living for Americans. Refusing to aid U.S. companies that are engaged in trade when foreign nations are aiding their companies' export efforts is tantamount to unilateral trade disarmament. The United States can compete and win in trade with other countries, but only if it is willing to play the game. We urge our colleagues to recognize the importance of the Government being involved in research and development and in promoting trade, and to join us in voting in favor of the Bingaman amendment.